

REMARKS

The Office Action of March 27, 2008 has been carefully considered.

Claims 2-5 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, as indefinite based on the recitation of "terminal cradle portions" in claim 2.

Claim 2 has been amended to define "terminal cradle portions" as cradle portions which are at the ends of the base strip. Between the terminal cradle portions are pairs of "back to back" cradle portions with arcuate segments which face away from each other; these are cradle portions in "back to back" relationship. No "back" cradle portions are found in the claim. The "back to back" relationship of the cradle portions is shown clearly in Fig. 3.

Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) over Gratz, while claims 8, 9, 11 and 13 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Gratz.

Claim 1 has now been amended to recite that the flat base strip is "flexible" as disclosed at page 7, lines 2-7 of the specification. Claim 7 has also been amended to recite that the cradle portions are formed "in a single row" as shown in Fig. 1.

A number of distinctions between the claimed invention and the support shown in Gratz are clear.

The base strip of Gratz is not flat; it is very clearly curved at the ends, as shown in Fig. 2. Moreover, as disclosed at col. 4, lines 36-41, the second side of the structure is a modified inverted version of the first side, where the parallel rib sections 29-31 correspond to the valleys 19-21 of the first side. Hence, the depressions of one side form the ribs of the opposite side, which is different from the invention in which the base is flat, and ribs on opposite

sides are independently formed.

In addition, the cradle supports of the invention are formed in a single row, whereas Gratz shows supports formed in two or three rows.

With regard to claim 7, because the ribs on one side of Gratz correspond to the depressions on the opposite side, the cradles are staggered. Claim 7 has been amended to recite that the cradle portions of the upper and lower surfaces are in opposed relationship; this is shown clearly in Figs. 6 and 7, for example.

Finally, according to the invention, the base strip and the cradle structure are flexible, enabling the cradles to support roles of varying diameter. The structure of Gratz is not flexible, owing *inter alia*, to the staggered cradles.

Given the substantial structural differences between the invention and the structure shown in Gratz, withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of the application with amended claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Ira J. Schultz
Registration No. 28666
Attorney for Applicant
(703)837-9600, ext. 23